

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Responsive to the requirement for restriction, applicant elects Group I, claims 24-31, drawn to the method, with partial traverse.

It is believed that the requirement for restriction between Groups I and II, however, is improper and should not be repeated.

The reasons why restriction between Groups I and II is improper, is that the apparatus of Group II cannot practice a method other than that of Group I; and conversely, the method of Group I cannot be practiced by an apparatus other than that of Group II.

In support of the requirement for restriction, it is said that Group I has a special technical feature directed to an extruding step not required for Group II. Notice, however, that claim 32 requires an extruder, which recites the feature with the same scope as the extruding step in claim 24.

In further support of the requirement for restriction, it is said that Group II has a special technical feature directed to a gas supply means not required for Group I. However, claim 24 recites that the plastic film is subjected to pressurized gas so that the gas diffuses in the cavitation bubbles. This would seem to be the same feature recited in the same scope as the gas supply means in claim 32.

There not being even one-way independence between the claims of Groups I and II, therefore, it is believed that they are directed to the same invention and should be examined together in the same application.

Accordingly, an action on the merits of claims 24-39 is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



Robert J. Patch, Reg. No. 17,355

745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297

RJP/fb